
From: Peres Da Costa, David
Sent: 18 January 2021 18:38
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning application 2019/1515/P - FORMAL TECHNICAL OBJECTION
Attachments: Report G2009-RP-01-E1 (1).pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Can this be logged as an objection on M3 and added to HPE RM

Thanks

David Peres da Costa
Senior Planning Officer

Tel.: 020 7974 5262
Visit camden.gov.uk for the latest council information and news

From: Catrien Harris [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2021 15:18
To: Peres Da Costa, David <David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk>
Cc: Vicki Harding [REDACTED]; Billie Bacal <[REDACTED]>; Caroline Formstone <[REDACTED]>; Miriam Saidi Flat 1 28 Netherhall Gdns <[REDACTED]>; Fabio Madar <[REDACTED]>; Simon Bacal <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Planning application 2019/1515/P - FORMAL TECHNICAL OBJECTION

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

FORMAL TECHNICAL OBJECTION

Planning application 2019/1515/P

Dear David,

I am formally putting in a Technical Objection to this application. This technical objection is based on the conclusions of an expert report published on January 8, 2021 by Michael Eldred of Eldred Geotechnics. I attach the report herewith.

Given its damning conclusions and proof that at this stage of application key information and investigations are missing, I request that you present Mr Eldred's report to the applicant and that the applicant is asked to provide the essential satisfactory evidence that the proposed development can be built safely together with evidence that it is achievable in a Basement Construction Plan.

This report in summary concludes that :

1. There is good reason to believe that the applicant's assumption as regards the depth of the foundation of no 24a flank boundary is not as deep as assumed and thus wrong.
 2. The proposed method of temporarily supporting adjacent excavation to this flank wall by inserting trench sheets, would expose ground below the wall foundation(made of brick rubble) and would NOT avoid the risk of significant damage to the wall and other parts of no 24a.
- Struts that would be required for temporary support would preclude efficient construction of any form of piled wall. The Engineer's Construction Method Statement is flawed. Its failure to demonstrate scheme feasibility and protection of neighbouring property lacks credibility in both those respects.
3. The risk of building damage this development presents to 24a and 24 Netherhall Gardens does NOT currently comply with Camden Planning Policy on basements and its SPD guidance, and would form an unreliable and unsatisfactory basis for planning conditions and/or s106 obligation.
 4. All this risk has been increased by several assumptions and adjustments made for ground movement assessment, that industry practice and experience strongly indicate may not go far enough and would significantly underestimate the possible degree of building damage to no 24a as a result of the proposed works.

It goes beyond imagination that 7 years into this planning application, Camden still has not requested the applicant to look into the foundations of 24a and 24. That Camden believes this application is safe enough to go ahead, without the applicant having any idea of the depth of the footings of neighbouring 24a (which stands within 1 meter from this development), demands serious explanation. Nor does the applicant have factual data on the extent of groundwater flow and its behaviour during and following storms. Yet, this site sits on a slope of more than 8% (between contour lines immediately above and below the site). Camden has failed to demand the rigorous technical investigation and standards which it normally requires for projects of such high risk.

The applicant should perform further investigations as stated in Michael Eldred's report and provide satisfactory evidence that a scheme to build no 26 is practicable and demonstrates that potential risk to 24a and 24 has been recognised and addressed.

I also demand that all the other reasons for our objections which we have highlighted in the past are still addressed. In particular these relate to the unnecessary massiveness of this project, incompatibility with the rules of our conservation area, the loss of light and privacy for its neighbours, the loss of trees and quintupling of hard vs soft surface without sufficient mitigating measures.

Kind regards,

Catrien Harris
Number 24 Netherhall Gardens